Tony Ashtiani, pro Se P.O.Box 12723 Tamuning Guam 96931 (671) 688-4844 (671) 653-5575 Attorney for Defendants

Mr. David Ledger

Tony H. Ashtiani,

vs.

DISTRICT COURT OF GUAM MAY 20 2003

MARY L. M. MORAN CLERK OF COURT

Ms. Elyze McDonald

DISTRICT COURT OF GUAM TERRITORY OF GUAM

8

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

ť

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

20

19

21 22

23 24

25

) Case No.: Civil No. 02-00032

) PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION RESPONSE TO (Response to plaintiff's counsel of proper service to) unrepresented party).

Inc,dba, Continental Micronesia)

. Continental Airlines ,

Defendant

Plaintiff,

Continenetal Micronesia

On Apr 03, 2003 plaintiff had filed with the Court Amended Motion to Seize cover-up in violation of EEOC director in coordinated effort of defendants' counselors in Hawaii and Guam. Exhibit A, the generating element of that motion was diversion of federal rule 5 in regards to Certified Mail.

There is no requirement for service by registered or certified mail Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(B) Exhibit B. While defendant continues sending pro se plaintiff certified mail, JOINT EXHIBIT C.

1 of 3 CV 02-00032

ORIGINAL

Plaintiff continuously had gone to CARLSMITH BALL LLP to retrieve his documents as the law firm ignores the pleading as plaintiff humbly asked to be served directly. "Unrepresented parties are served directly". Exhibit D.

It is note worthy that defendant fails to respond to the first motion as filed by the court in sequence and in the present response by the defendant filed on May 16 2003 there is no mention of the Certified Mail.

Defense counsel diverts and steers away from the word "certified mail" in 5 pages of response and in fact not responsive to the root of the issue at hand. While defendant's firm CARLSMITH is in attempt to flood the pro se plaintiff with certified mail and chip away at his time by making him stand in long lines at the post office by representing his slip in exchange of mail, Certainly not the intend of Federal Civil Procedures Rule 5, The Public Officials and Federal Attorneys whom wrote these rules had logical elements in prioritizing these methods of service as it is evident, first federally-endorsed to ensure that service of court-field documents on parties are accomplished is written as (NUMBER 1) #1. "handing it to the person" EXHIBT E.

Plaintiff did not ask for any special treatment, rather asked defendant not to divert or modify the rule, in the other hand defendant is refrain from abuse of discretion and process.

Plaintiff vigorously adheres to federal rule 5 at all his servings to the defendant so there will not be any question of service raised. Certificate of service filing with the Court speaks for itself. Plaintiff had not asked to be tracked down, plaintiff has cell phone and it shall prevent defendants of any concern of tracking down. Regardless plaintiff is at the law library majority of the time.

Defendant states, "Through its own research, defendant has not discovered any case law that requires that an unrepresented party must only be **personally** served".

In support of memorandum of law VINDINGI Vs. MEYER 441 F.2d 376,377-78 (2d Cir. 1971) (Notice of action proposed or taken should also have been sent to plaintiff personally. In the absence of a court order directing such service, the defendant's attorneys were at fault for failing to do what common sense required.) in doing so they took unfair advantage of the plaintiff. EXHIBIT F.

Plaintiff requests that plaintiffs' pleading to be granted by Honorable Chief Judge John S. Unpingco.

Tony H. Ashtiani

Respectfully

Dated this 20th day of May 2003

Tony Ashtiani (pro se) 1 P.O.Box 12723 FILED Tamuning Guam 96931 DISTRICT COURT OF GUAM 671-688-4844 APR 03 2003 671-653-5575 3 MARY L. M. MORAN 4 Attorneys for Defendant CLERK OF COURT CARLSMITH BALL LLP Mr. David Ledger 5 Ms. Elyze McDonald 6 7 DISTRICT COURT OF GUAM 8 TERRITORY OF GUAM 9 10 Tony H. Ashtiani, Plaintiff, Civil Case No.: 02-00032 11 VS. 12 13 Continenetal Micronesia Inc, EEOC postal violation of Director in coordinated 14 defendant's dba, Continental Micronesia, ofcounselors Hawaii and Guam. 15 Continental Airlines, 16 Defendant 17 18 19 This Matter has come before the District Court of Guam 20 based on the DECLARATION OF MAILING presented by Continental 21 attorney Mr. David Ledger, "(I will cause to be served, via 22 certified mail return receipt requested)" Exhibit A. See Fed. R. 23 Civ P.5(b)(2)(B), Mailing a copy to the last Known address of 24 the person served. Service by mail is complete on mailing 25 Exhibit B. RECEIARD CARLSMITH BALL 4-4-03

Page (1) OF (5) CV 02-00032

Document 41

Case 1:02-cv-00032

Date:

Time: Filed 05/20/2003

5–7 Comment

is by personal delivery of a copy of the document.³⁷ However, service may also be accomplished by mailing a copy of the document.^{37,1} These are the two most common methods of service currently used. However, the rule also authorizes service by delivery of a copy of the document in question to the court clerk when the person to be served has no known address.^{37,2} Furthermore, if the parties to be served consents to it in writing, that party may be served by whatever electronic means to which he or she (or his or her counsel) has consented.^{37,3}

Rule 5 has broad definition of "personal delivery." When Rule 5 service is made by personal delivery, the papers in question may either be handed directly to the attorney or unrepresented party, 37.4 or they may be left at the attorney's or party's office with a clerk or other person in charge, or, if no one is in charge, left in a conspicuous place in the office. 38 If the office is closed, or the person to be served has no office, the papers may be left at the person's dwelling house or usual place of abode with a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there. 39 It is not acceptable service, however, to slip the papers under the office door of an attorney whose office is closed. 40

Rule 5 service by mail is made by ordinary, first class mail. Rule 5 service by mail is made by mailing the paper in question to the attorney or the unrepresented party at his or her last known address. 41 There is no requirement for service by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested. 42 A document or paper is "mailed" within the meaning of the rule if it is placed in an envelope, addressed to the attorney or unrepresented party at his or her last known address, the proper postage is affixed, and the envelope is deposited in a U.S. Postal Service mailbox or Post Office. 43 Facsimile transmission is not considered service by mail, 44 although service by fax may be authorized as service by electronic consent if the party to be served has executed a written consent authorizing this form of service. 44.1

Service by mail requires only mailing, not receipt. Service by mail is complete at the time of mailing. 45 The service is complete even if there is no receipt of

- 41 Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(B).
- **42** See Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(B); cf. Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(f)(2)(C)(ii), (i)(1)(B), (i)(2).
- **43** See, e.g., Rivera v. M/T Fossarina, 840 F.2d 152, 155 (1st Cir. 1988).
- 44 Salley v. Bd. of Governors, Univ. of N.C., 136 F.R.D. 417, 419 (M.D.N.C. 1991) ("fax transmission may not be deemed service by mail").
 - 44.1 See Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(D).
 - 45 Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(B).

rRel 103 3/02 Pub/0903

(Matthew Bender & Co., Inc.)

³⁷ See Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(A).

^{37.1} See Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(B).

^{37.2} See Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(C).

^{37.3} See Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(D).

^{37.4} Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(A)(i).

³⁸ Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(A)(ii).

³⁹ Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(A)(iii).

⁴⁰ Sinett Inc. v. Blairex Labs., 909 F.2d 253, 254 (7th Cir. 1990) (despite deadline for service of motion for new trial looming, court held slipping papers under door was improper ser-

vice).

ltem is at: Post Office <i>(See back)</i>		Available for Pick-u	up After We will redeliver o		
_/		Date:	Time: pick up. See reve	rs	
Letter	For Delivery: (Enter to delivered by service typ	tal number of items	If checked, you or your agent must be prest time of delivery to algoritor item.		
Large envelope, magazine.	For Notice Left: (Check applicable item)		Article Number(s)		
catalog, etc. Parcel	Express Mail (We will attempt to deliver on the next delivery day unless		7002 po tou 7159 51	7 '	
Restricted Delivery	you instruct the post office to hold it.)	Return Receipt			
_ Perishable	Certified	Delivery			
ltem	Recorded	Confirmation	Notice Left Section		
_ Other:	Delivery Firm Bill	Signature Confirmation	Customer Name and Address Mv. Towy H. Astrani		
rticle Requiring Payment Amount Due 1 Postage Due □ COD □ Customs \$			(71/2		
→ Final Noti	ce: Article will to sender on		Delivered By and Date		

Sorry We Missed You! We & L tem is at: Post Office (See back)		Available for Pick-up	į.	We will red you or you	ır agent c <i>a</i>
Tome deli	delivered by service type For Notice Left: (Chec Express Mail (We will attempt to deliver on the next delivery day unless you instruct the post office to hold it.) Certified Recorded	Ictice Left: (Check applicable item) Express Mall (We will Registered attempt to deliver on the next deliver) day unless Insured you histuat the post office to hold it.) Certified Return Receipt for Merchandise Delivery			
Other: Article Requirir	The Comment of the Co	Signature Gonfirmation Amount Due	Gustomer Nam	e and Address ny 14: Az+ 12120	lanı
ALL NOT WELL AND THE STATE OF T	e □ COD □ Customs tice: Article will	\$ 	Delivered By ar		- 1

orry We Missed You! We Pe pm 16 at _ Post Office (See back)		Available for Pick-u	(7) ITime:	We will redeliver or you or your agent car pick up. See reverse
Letter Large- envelope, magazile, catalog, etc. Parcel Restricted Delivery Parshable Item Other	For Delivery: (Enter to delivery): (Enter to delivery): For Notice Left. (Chec Express Mail (We will attempt to deliver on the next delivery delivers you instruct the post office to hole it.) Certified Recorded: Delivery Elim Bill.	K applicable item) Registered	at time of d Article Number(s	000.0004 974 0 123 (
A Hall Vo		Amount Due	Delivered By and	12723 Paris

m is at: _ Post Office <i>(See back)</i>	Available for Pick-u Date:	o After l'Time:	We will redeliver or you or your agent ca pick up. See reverse
Letter Large envelope, magazine, catalog, etc. Parcel Restricted Delivery Perishable Item Other: For Delivery: (Enter delivered by service ty For Notice Left: (Che attempt to deliver on inext delivery day unle you instruct the post office to hold it.) Certified Recorded Delivery	rotal number of items pe) ack applicable item) all Registered the ss Insured Return Receipt for Merchandise Delivery Confirmation Signature Confirmation Amount Due	If checked, you or your agent must be pressent time of delivery to sign for item Article Number(s) 1の2 所の いいは イルの イカルの	
Firm Bill ticle Requiring Payment Postage Due □ COD □ Customs		Customer Name and Address Tony R. Ashtian 1 12723	
Final Notice: Article will be returned to sender on		Delivered By	and Date

Sorry We Missed You! We PDeliver for You MAY 1.7 Parcel Letter item is at: United States Postal Service Final Notice: Article will be returned to sender on PS. Form 3849. Navember 1000 ☐ Postage Due ☐ COD ☐ Customs Article Requiring Payment Post Office (See back) Other: For Delivery: (Enter total number of items delivered by service type) For Notice Left: (Check applicable item) Firm Bill Certified Express Mall (We will Date: 69 Available for Pick-up After Amount Due Insured __ Registered Delivery
Confirmation
Signature
Confirmation Return Receipt for Merchandise Notice Left Section
Customer Name and Address

+ Fortian Article Number(s) Time: Delivered By and Date If checked, you or your agent must be present at time of delivery to sign for item 1000 pape Sender's Name 170 pick up. See reverse. We will redeliver or /ou or your agent car Sauc 8084

Case 1:02-cv-00032

Document 41

Filed 05/20/2003

Page 8 of 11

possession of the property at the time of the seizure. 30 This provision would be applicable, for example, when a prompt deposition was needed for an in rem maritime action, in which case service on the custodian of the ship, rather than on the actual owner, would comport with these special Rule 5(a)'s service requirements. 31

Rule 5(b)—Same: How Made

Service under Rule 5 is made on attorney for party when party is represented by attorney. Whenever a party is represented by counsel, pleadings and papers, other than the original complaint, must be served on the party's attorney, unless the court specifically orders service to be made on the party.³² Thus, for example, in a class action, service or notice to the attorney of record constitutes service or notice to the entire class.³³ If service is made directly on the represented party, without approval of the court, the service will be invalid, and it may also be a violation of professional ethics.³⁴

Unrepresented parties are served directly. On the other hand, a party who has no attorney of record in a proceeding, or no longer is represented by counsel, must be served directly.³⁵

Court retains discretion to order that represented party be served directly. Even when a party is represented, court do sometimes order that notice be given directly to a party. A court is likely to order that notice be given directly to a party when the notice involves an order of a type that, if disobeyed, is punishable with contempt, or when an order or motion seeks to find the party in contempt for disobedience of a prior order.³⁶

Rule 5 service may be made by a variety of means. There is no one, fixed method for service under Rule 5. The most obvious method of service a document

(Rel.103-3/02 Pub.090)

(Matthew Bender & Co., Inc.)

³⁰ Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(a).

³¹ Fed. R. Civ. P. 5, advisory committee notes of 1970.

³² Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(1).

³³ United States v. Pend Oreille Pub. Util. Dist. No.1, 28 F.3d 1544, 1553 (9th Cir. 1994)(1995) (service of counterclaim on class representative constitutes notice to class).

³⁴ Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(1); Bueford v. Resolution Trust Corp., 991 F.2d 481, 487 (8th Cir. 1993) (notice to party directly when represented by counsel may violate professional ethics).

³⁵ Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(1); Love v. Hayden, 757 F. Supp. 1209, 1211 (D. Kan. 1991) (service on attorney general ineffective as to individual

state officials, sued in their individual capacity, when plaintiff failed to show pursuant that Office of Attorney General appeared for and represented these individuals in their individual capacity); SEC v. Everest Management Corp., 87 F.R.D. 100, 102 n.1 (S.D.N.Y. 1980) (when attorney no longer in representative capacity, direct service on party is proper under Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(1)).

³⁶ See, e.g., I.A.M. Nat'l Pension Fund v. Wakefield Indus., 699 F.2d 1254, 1261 (D.C. Cir. 1983) (OSC re contempt generally served directly on party, as opposed to attorney, by order of court pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b), which vests discretionary power to so order in court).

, 64, 194, 196

:21, 21:25 5:105, 26:106

ule 4 or subpoena, a deputy United, who shall make served anywhere t is located, and, orial limits of that

An order of civil unction issued to d in any district. tate in which the the United States be enforced was

(5th Cir.1966). The order to show cause. 3 F.2d 711 (5th Cir.

the reach of the court anctions. Nationwide is and injunctions is to criminal contempt: arrest of a criminal ited States, 28 U.S.C. then arrested may be ict in which punish-crim.P. 40. Thus, the ontempt enforcement that person may be

o provide a choice of ctions in those situations in those situation that the brought in the by a contumacious 66 (1869). This is so or inaction occurred in which the enforce-cted. E.g., McCourt-

ney v. United States, 291 Fed. 497 (8th Cir.), cert. denied, 263 U.S. 714 (1923). For this purpose, the rule as before does not distinguish between parties

and other persons subject to contempt sanctions by reason of their relation or connection to parties.

LIBRARY REFERENCES

Law Review and Journal Commentaries

Changes to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Lawrence W. Newman and Michael Burrows, 211 N.Y.L.J. 3 (Jan. 31, 1994).

Rule 5. Serving and Filing Pleadings and Other Papers

(a) Service: When required. Except as otherwise provided in these rules, every order required by its terms to be served, every pleading subsequent to the original complaint unless the court otherwise orders because of numerous defendants, every paper relating to discovery required to be served upon a party unless the court otherwise orders, every written motion other than one which may be heard ex parte, and every written notice, appearance, demand, offer of judgment, designation of record on appeal, and similar paper shall be served upon each of the parties. No service need be made on parties in default for failure to appear except that pleadings asserting new or additional claims for relief against them shall be served upon them in the manner provided for service of summons in Rule 4.

In an action begun by seizure of property, in which no person need be or is named as defendant, any service required to be made prior to the filing of an answer, claim, or appearance shall be made upon the person having custody or possession of the property at the time of its seizure.

(b) Making Service.

- (1) Service under Rules 5(a) and 77(d) on a party represented by an attorney is made on the attorney unless the court orders service on the party.
 - (2) Service under Rule 5(a) is made by:
 - (A) Delivering a copy to the person served by:
 - (i) handing it to the person;
 - (ii) leaving it at the person's office with a clerk or other person in charge, or if no one is in charge leaving it in a conspicuous place in the office; or
 - (iii) if the person has no office or the office is closed, leaving it at the person's dwelling house or usual place of abode with someone of suitable age and discretion residing there.
 - **(B)** Mailing a copy to the last known address of the person served. Service by mail is complete on mailing.
 - (C) If the person served has no known address, leaving a copy with the clerk of the court.
 - (D) Delivering a copy by any other means, including electronic means, consented to in writing by the person served. Service by electronic means is complete on transmission; service by other consented means is complete when the person making service delivers the copy to the agency designated to make delivery. If authorized by local rule, a party may make service under this subparagraph (D) through the court's transmission facilities.
- (3) Service by electronic means under Rule 5(b)(2)(D) is not effective if the party making service learns that the attempted service did not reach the person to be served.

Normally the dismissal of an action for failure to prosecute is a matter within the discretion of the district court judge. Fischer v. Dover Steamship Co., Inc., 218 F.2d 682 (2d Cir. 1955). In the present case, however, we have the unusual fact of the complete disappearance of plaintiff's attorney.

Although the district court found that plaintiff 'let eighteen months go by before inquiring about the status of his pending lawsuit,' plaintiff's affidavit states that he 'tried diligently to find Mr. Ennis.' We do not know what efforts plaintiff made or what assurances he may have received from Ennis's office where somebody apparently remained to answer the telephone for some time after Ennis's disappearance. We believe that this case should be remanded for a full evidentiary hearing on the issue of whether plaintiff in fact neglected his suit. See Welden v. Grace Line, Inc., 404 F.2d 76 (2d Cir. 1968).

The procedure followed in this case of sending all notices, motions and orders to Ennis after it was known that he had disappeared seems to us to indicate a disposition to take refuge in the empty formality of fulfilling the letter of the legal requirements while disregarding the realistic demands presented by the situation. Surely once it became known that Ennis had disappeared, notice of action proposed or taken should also have been sent to plaintiff personally. In the absence of a court order directing such service, the defendant's attorneys *378

(Cite as: 441 F.2d 376, *378)

were at fault for failing to do what common

(Cite as: 441 F.2d 376, *378)

sense required. In doing so they took unfair advantage of the plaintiff. See Negron v. Peninsular Navigation Corp., 279 F.2d 859 (2d Cir. 1960).

In reversing the order in this case, we do not depart from the regular course of our decisions upholding discretionary orders of dismissal for failure to prosecute. See, e.g., Redac Project 6426, Inc. v. Allstate Insurance Co., 412 F.2d 1043 (2d Cir.1969); Rinieri v. News Syndicate Co., 385 F.2d 818 (2d Cir.1967); Hines v. Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co., 341 F.2d 229 (2d Cir.1965); Cucurillo v. Schulte, Bruns Schiff Gesellschaft, M.B.H. v. Universal Terminal & Stevedoring Corp., 324 F.2d 234 (2d Cir.1963); Ohliger v. United States, 308 F.2d 667 (2d Cir.1962); Parker v. Broadcast Music, Inc., 289 F.2d 313 (2d Cir.1961); Fischer v. Dover Steamship Co., Inc., supra. The facts here are readily distinguishable from the facts in those decisions.

Reversed and remanded for an evidentiary hearing.

C.A.N.Y. 1971.

Vindigni v. Meyer,

441 F.2d 376, 1971 A.M.C. 1322, 14 Fed.R.Serv.2d 1436

END OF DOCUMENT

Copr. (C) West 2003 No Claim to Orig. U.S. Govt. Works